

1 KEKER & VAN NEST LLP  
2 ROBERT A. VAN NEST - #84065  
3 rvannest@kvn.com  
4 CHRISTA M. ANDERSON - #184325  
5 canderson@kvn.com  
6 MICHAEL S. KWUN - #198945  
7 mkwun@kvn.com  
8 633 Battery Street  
9 San Francisco, CA 94111-1809  
10 Tel: 415.391.5400  
11 Fax: 415.397.7188

12 KING & SPALDING LLP  
13 DONALD F. ZIMMER, JR. - #112279  
14 fzimmer@kslaw.com  
15 CHERYL A. SABNIS - #224323  
16 csabnis@kslaw.com  
17 101 Second St., Suite 2300  
18 San Francisco, CA 94105  
19 Tel: 415.318.1200  
20 Fax: 415.318.1300

21 KING & SPALDING LLP  
22 SCOTT T. WEINGAERTNER  
23 (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
24 sweingaertner@kslaw.com  
25 ROBERT F. PERRY  
26 rpperry@kslaw.com  
27 BRUCE W. BABER (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
28 1185 Avenue of the Americas  
1900 University Avenue  
New York, NY 10036  
Tel: 212.556.2100  
Fax: 212.556.2222

IAN C. BALLON - #141819  
ballon@gtlaw.com  
HEATHER MEEKER - #172148  
meekerh@gtlaw.com  
GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP  
1900 University Avenue  
East Palo Alto, CA 94303  
Tel: 650.328.8500  
Fax: 650.328.8508

29 Attorneys for Defendant  
30 GOOGLE INC.

31  
32 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
33  
34 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
35  
36 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

37 ORACLE AMERICA, INC.,  
38 Plaintiff,  
39 v.  
40 GOOGLE INC.,  
41 Defendant.

42 Case No. 3:10-CV-03561-WHA

43 **GOOGLE'S SUPPLEMENTAL  
44 COPYRIGHT LIABILITY TRIAL BRIEF  
45 PURSUANT TO MARCH 26, 2012 ORDER**

46 Judge: Hon. William Alsup

1       The Court has asked Google to address Oracle's contentions regarding an alleged field-  
 2 of-use restriction and its purported applicability to the Apache Harmony project. As explained  
 3 below, the Apache Software Foundation ("Apache") licenses Apache Harmony to the public  
 4 without *any* field-of-use restrictions, and rejected Sun's attempt to impose such a limit on the use  
 5 of Apache Harmony. Notwithstanding these facts, Sun has never sued Apache, and has never  
 6 asserted that the use of the Apache Harmony libraries is conditioned on a field-of-use limitation.  
 7 To the contrary, Jonathan Schwartz, Sun's CEO at the relevant times, has testified that Apache  
 8 Harmony can be used for any purpose so long as the resulting product is not called "Java."  
 9 There is no field-of-use restriction on the use of Apache Harmony. Oracle's field-of-use  
 10 restriction argument is a red herring.

11 **I. The Apache Harmony project was launched in August 2005, and licensed without  
 12 any field-of-use restrictions.**

13       In August 2005, Apache announced the Apache Harmony project, the goal of which was  
 14 to create an open-source product compatible with J2SE. This project followed open-source  
 15 efforts by other groups to achieve the same goal, such as GNU Classpath from the Free Software  
 16 Foundation. Apache licenses Apache Harmony to the public for free under version 2 of the open  
 17 source Apache License. This license does not have any field-of-use restrictions.<sup>1</sup>

18 **II. Apache never agreed to a field-of-use restriction, and Sun never objected to the use  
 19 by Apache and others of the Java language APIs.**

20       Jonathan Schwartz, Sun's CEO from 2006 to 2010, testified that, [REDACTED]  
 21 [REDACTED]  
 22 [REDACTED]  
 23 [REDACTED]  
 24 [REDACTED]  
 25 [REDACTED]

26       <sup>1</sup> See Apache License, Version 2.0, available at <http://www.apache.org/licenses/LICENSE-2.0.html>. Version 2.0 of the General Public License, the open source license that governs use of  
 27 GNU Classpath, similarly has no field-of-use restriction. See General Public License, Version  
 28 2.0, available at <http://www.gnu.org/licenses/gpl-2.0.html>.

1 [REDACTED]  
 2 [REDACTED]  
 3 Schwartz Depo. at 49:11-50:10; *see also id* at 47:17-23 [REDACTED]  
 4 [REDACTED]  
 5 [REDACTED]

6 [REDACTED] However, “In order to call  
 7 your product Java, and in order to feature to the marketplace that you were a Java phone or a  
 8 Java device and to get that brand, you needed to pass that the—the TCKs, the Testing [sic]  
 9 Compatibility Kits.” *Id.* at 46:17-21.

10 Starting in August 2006, Apache attempted to obtain from Sun a license to the J2SE 5.0  
 11 technology compatibility kit (“TCK”). The license *to the TCK* (i.e. to the suite of compatibility  
 12 tests) that Sun offered to Apache would have limited the use of Apache Harmony to certain  
 13 fields of use. Apache, however, never agreed to such a limitation.

14 In May 2007, with no TCK license in place for Apache Harmony, Schwartz publicly  
 15 stated, “there is no reason that Apache cannot ship Harmony today.” Trial Ex. 2341; Schwartz  
 16 Depo. at 51:15-22. According to Schwartz, however, Apache “wanted, in fact, to be able to call  
 17 Harmony Java. And we held firm and said no, that’s our core value. If you want to call it Java,  
 18 you can pay, you know, the fee to go run the test and compatibility kits, and that enable you to  
 19 tell your customers that you actually had a licensed Java runtime. But absent that statement,  
 20 they, you know, couldn’t say that, and they were frustrated by it.” Schwartz Depo. at 52:16-23.

21 In June 2007, Apache wrote an open letter to Sun, requesting a TCK license without a  
 22 field-of-use restriction. That same month, in an effort spearheaded by Oracle Corporation,  
 23 twelve signatories, including a Google Engineering VP, urged Schwartz to grant Apache an  
 24 unencumbered TCK license. *See* Trial Ex. 2347. Sun, however, refused. Because Apache was  
 25 unwilling to agree any field-of-use restriction, it *did not license* the TCK. As a result, Apache  
 26 *did not agree to—and never has agreed to—a field-of-use limitation for Apache Harmony.*

27 The lack of a TCK license, however, did not prevent others from using Apache Harmony:  
 28 [REDACTED]

1 [REDACTED]  
 2 [REDACTED]  
 3 [REDACTED]  
 4 [REDACTED]  
 5 [REDACTED]  
 6 [REDACTED]

7 Schwartz Depo. at 83:15-84:7. Even without a TCK license, “[a]nybody else who wanted to go  
 8 create their own runtime, whether it was Apache Harmony or GNU Classpath, was free to do so;  
 9 they just couldn’t call it Java.” *Id.* at 182:2-5. Mr. Schwartz will testify that commercial  
 10 products from IBM and Hewlett-Packard used the Apache Harmony implementation of the Java  
 11 language APIs without objection from Sun.

12 **III. There is no field-of-use restriction for Apache Harmony.**

13 The dispute between Apache and Sun was about branding, and the ability to say that  
 14 Apache Harmony is Java compatible. The end result was that Apache *did not agree* to a field-of-  
 15 use restriction. Notwithstanding Apache’s refusal to limit the field of use for Apache Harmony,  
 16 Sun never sued Apache. In fact, Sun’s CEO has testified that *anyone* can use the Apache  
 17 Harmony code (and thus its implementation of the Java language API specifications)—so long as  
 18 it does not call its product “Java.”

19 Finally, Google in any event does not call Android “Java.” Google has used the term  
 20 “Java” in its nominative, non-brand sense to describe, for example, how developers can use the  
 21 free and open Java programming language to write applications for the Android platform. That,  
 22 however, is not an attempt to brand the Android product “Java.” Indeed, Oracle’s complaint  
 23 does not include a trademark infringement count. Oracle’s field-of-use restriction argument is  
 24 irrelevant and should be rejected.

25 Dated: March 27, 2012

KEKER & VAN NEST LLP

26

By: /s/ Robert A. Van Nest  
 ROBERT A. VAN NEST

27

Attorneys for Defendant  
 GOOGLE INC.

28